

Designing the Earth Anew

Universal Platform

for

Developing a Sustainable Earth Future Cooperatively

For us to live in a world suitable for us all, we first have to know what such a world should look like, so we can together strive for it!

by

Mr. Jan Hearthstone

For my children, all our families, all friends, ohana.

Table of Contents:

Universal Platform for Creating a Sustainable Earth 1

How I arrived at the concept of designing the future collectively 6

Designing a Lasting World Peace Together 11

Ecologically and Socially Sustainable Education 13

Mahayana: Philosophy for Sustainability 19

O Bodhisattvas! 20

Why Prayers, Meditations, Wishes, and Any Such Don't Help to Establish a Lasting Peace in the World 21

Home: The Very "Leverage Point" 22

Preventing a Ton of Cure: Disaster Preparedness 24

Bibliography 27

Credit and Dedication iii

The Necessary Qualities of Sustainable Earth Vision/Model iv

Universal Platform

for

Developing a Sustainable Earth Future Cooperatively:

Global Citizens Envisioning the Future Together.

> **A sustainable world can never be fully realized until it is widely envisioned. The vision must be built up by many people before it is complete and compelling.**
> (Meadows 2004, p273)

To which I have to add—the “vision"/model has to be *designed* by, ideally, everybody who has a stake in the future of this planet; This in order to resolve any differences, controversies, conflicts, and complaints before those even manifest in real life; To prevent having to (again and again) keep on fixing problems instead of focusing on creating a future that would be desired by all.

> **You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete***
> (attributed to Buckminster Fuller, though I have not been able, so far, to find the source)

R. Buckminster Fuller was trying to implement *his* vision of an ideal world. The “Universal Platform” (p1), in contrast, would coherently unify and harmonize, ideally, *everybody's* vision of an ideal world using definite criteria based on what is known about Earth and societal processes.

> **One can--and eventually must--decide that a fate is an inadequate substitute for a future.**
> **Umair Haque**
> http://www.twylah.com/umairh/tweets/168374310837305344

We have to know what kind of a world we want to live in, if the one that we live in now we don't like.
The challenge is to come up with an ideal of a world that would optimally suit us all; an ideal that all of us on Earth could focus on and strive for--a harmonious, truly sustainable co-existence of us all on Earth.

It has to be an ideal accessible, discussable, and amendable by every- and any-body at all times--the germ of a true global (and, of course local at the same time)

governance--a government where the governing would be done by the means of a vision/model in common worked on, held and striven for by all continuously.

The valid competition would be to improve on the ideal, and to find better ways of achieving this ideal, instead of competing for advantage over others to the detriment of the whole, as has the prevalent practice been till now.

There would, eventually, cease any need for "leaders" and "followers"--everyone would have the potential to take a part in embodying their own ideas (in concert with the wishes for an ideal existence of all others) in the continuously being shaped collective vision/model. The resulting collective vision/model would not be static--an ideal could not remain an ideal without the possibility of improving on it perpetually. The "Universal Platform" (p1) would be a space to resolve any differences, controversies, conflicts, and any complaints that there ever might arise among us *before those manifest in real life;* it would become a superior way of a collective self-rule.

What is being referred to in Donella Meadows' quote at the beginning of the article--the "envisioning" and "vision" of the ideal to be realized--are indeed essential for achieving that which is being desired:

> **... Vision without action is useless. But action without vision is directionless and feeble. Vision is absolutely necessary to guide and motivate.** …
> (Meadows 2004, p272).

The vision, indeed, " ... must be built up by many people before it is complete and compelling. ..." (Meadows 2004, p273)--But how to do this? How to allow a vast number of people (potentially all who live on Earth and have a stake in the future of this world, each perhaps with their own vision) to cooperate on creating one vision/model of one Earth's future?

This mind staggering task might stop many from even ever contemplating such an undertaking--an assumption validated by the lack of any progress in presenting a platform on which to unite all of the possible visions of a sustainable Earth ever since

Donella Meadows' passing away (2001).
Despite Donella Meadows' "visioning"/"envisioning" being taught at many places in the world, the one thing needed for starting to work on a to all acceptable future--a place where all could relate their ideas with the ideas of everyone else--is missing. Where is it that anyone could compare their vision with the visions of others?
On a local level it might be possible (even though it is not done properly so far anywhere to my knowledge--correct me, please, if you know otherwise), but how about coordinating all the local visions with the vision for the whole world?

There might, possibly, be a way that would allow to accommodate all of our visions globally, but, only as long as we can all agree that we all want to live truly and provably sustainably.

Consider this:

Imagine an Earth where humans live in zero population growth communities situated amidst wild, by humans unregulated, nature, where all the other species that we share this planet with live untroubled by humans.

These communities could exist at what-so-ever level of complexity of sustainability (from "hunter-gatherer" way of life to anything more complex), as long as those communities would be *transparently* and *demonstrably* sustainable, so that their way of living would not adversely affect the existence of other human communities and other life on Earth in any way.

The basic population density level on Earth should be based on the least complex ecologically and socially sustainable life-style, so that should any more advanced forms of a sustainable life-style existing on Earth fail for any reason, hunter-gatherer life-style is the least complex one at which humanity could exist comfortably, providing there is an ample territory to do it on with sufficient safety margin that would allow for any, even now unforeseeable, exigencies. In this way there would be no need for having to accommodate all other species sharing the Earth with us in any special way--those would always live in balance with humans who would not be able to inflict much damage on them due to their small number.

One possible way of ensuring that any communities at a level of sustainability more

complex than that of hunter-gatherers would really be ecologically and socially sustainable within this universal vision/model could be "evolved" to the desired level of complexity--not driven by external circumstances, but rather pulled towards the vision of the ideal--from the least complex one possible, step by step, demonstrating that each more complex level of sustainability would indeed be sustainable ecologically and socially in every aspect; all communities together making sure not to exceed the total population level of humans on Earth that would always remain fixed at what it would be if all humans lived as hunter-gatherers--this as a safety measure in case that people, if not satisfied with higher complexity level of sustainability, would always have the opportunity to fall back to living at less complex levels of sustainability.

I imagine that people (both--in constructing the model, and in the sustainable world that would be the vision realized) would be able to "vote with their feet"--at any time when they would feel that they would like to live, either at a different place, or at a different level of sustainability, they would just re-group/re-locate. In this way social sustainability would be ensured--no one would be forced to stay at any place, or at any level of complexity of sustainability.

Again--it must not be understood that I advocate that people should become hunter-gatherers and then tried to work their way to the level of complexity of sustainability that they would like to live at in real life! All this above would be happening in models (of any appropriate kind, e. g. "gedanken experiments, etc.) for the purposes of getting a practicable vision/model together.

The what-so-ever model(s)/vision(s) that would be arrived at should not be anything less than a portrayal of an as perfect as possible situation. (However--these visions/models should never be considered as being static; they would evolve along with the evolution of thought on the subject.) The model(s) arrived at should not be impeded by what might be considered possible, or impossible, in our current, very imperfect world that we are forced to live in now:

> **Visioning means imagining, at first generally and then with increasing specificity, what you really want. That is, what you really want, not what someone has taught you to want, and not what you have learned to be willing to settle for. Visioning means taking off the constraints of "feasibility," of disbelief and past**

disappointments, and letting your mind dwell upon its most noble, uplifting, treasured dreams. ...
(Meadows 2004, p272)

The ideal should not be limited by what might be thought of as being "possible", or "impossible" at any given time!:

... In order to conceive of what you truly want to create, you must separate what you want from what you think is possible. ...
(Fritz 1984, p71)

The ways of achieving the ideal depicted in the visions/models should start suggesting themselves as soon as the depiction of the ideal in the model would appear to be "realistic" enough.

The result would be a humanity that would harmoniously exist with itself and all other life on Earth, providing that humanity would adhere strictly to the "zero population growth" policy, and to living demonstrably and transparently sustainably.

A way of providing a satisfactory definition of "sustainable"/"sustainably" would be to demonstrate transparently in models (of any appropriate kind) that any situation would, or would not, indeed be "sustainable", that at no point there is anything that would be deleterious to the comfort of other humans or other species.

There is a need for a model of what the Earth should ideally look like that would be freely accessible by anyone on Earth, so that everyone could, at any point, see what progress is being made towards the ideal at any time, so that there is a reference available for any undertaking that might concern the welfare of anyone on the planet.

"Model" - definitions:

... 10. a simplified representation of a system or phenomenon, as in the sciences or economics, with any hypotheses required to describe the system or explain the phenomenon, often mathematically.
http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/model

A representation of a system that allows for investigation of the properties of the system and, in some cases, prediction of future outcomes. Models are often used in quantitative analysis and technical analysis, and sometimes also used in fundamental analysis.

www.investorwords.com/5662/model.html

Note (1):
The "vision" in the title harks back to Donella Meadows' "visioning"/"envisioning", which owes its being to Robert Fritz's "Technologies For Creating" (TFC). What "visioning"/"envisioning" is for Donella Meadows, Robert Fritz calls a "choice". Fritz' *The Path of Least Resistance* (Fritz 1984) is a necessary reading for anyone who wants to understand what Donella Meadows' "visioning"/"envisioning" is.
I think that "model" could be a more fortuitous choice of a term instead of "visioning"/"envisioning".

The "Universal Platform for Developing Sustainable Earth Vision/Model Cooperatively"(p1) is a basis for a complete, all-encompassing vision of a sustainable Earth; Complete, because any sustainable life-style can be accommodated within the model, as long as that "life-style" indeed is provably sustainable.
What is needed now is to make this all-encompassing vision of a sustainable Earth "compelling".

You might also, perhaps, look at what I wrote about R. B. Fuller's "World Game" - Buckminster R. Fuller's World Game and ModelEarth - http://www.modelearth.org/buckymodelearth.html.

How I arrived at the concept of designing the future collectively.

Since early on in my life I had been attracted to self-sufficiency, feeling that the "system" I existed in was grossly inadequate to support intelligent, rational existence. I gravitated in my interests towards any examples of people providing for their needs "from the scratch", such as growing their own food, building their own shelters, making their own clothes etc. This continued well into my mature years when I already had children--I was imagining us living somewhere on our own land independently ... .

I am sure that many people entertain such, or similar, fantasies that eventually subside and become buried under the heap of quotidian existential concerns, but I had a "lucky break"--I was made homeless, and I had a few years to reflect on how to get out of my predicament; eventually it occurred to me that trying to re-establish

myself into the same system that allows homelessness to exist in the first place did not make any sense--I would be putting my efforts into allowing the same to happen to me again potentially--I resolved to solve this conundrum. This is how I went about it:

While still homeless I enrolled in college in order to acquire knowledge and learn skills that would be good to have for a self-sufficient, of the society independent living.
I started taking horticulture, weaving, and pottery courses.
I was learning how to grow plants for fiber and dyes used in weaving--I even started a small garden at the college to grow those. I was learning to use locally found clay and minerals (for glaze) for pottery ...

With time, though, I realized that even if I, together with my family, did achieve self-sufficiency, without the whole of humanity becoming also self-sufficient, my family's self-sufficiency would be imperiled by the existing system that abhors anything not under its control. I decided to study social sciences and I enrolled in Anthropology classes in order to learn about human society.

In Ecological Anthropology I started to find out about how humans function within the whole Earth ecological system and I started being interested in ecological and social sustainability of humans. I realized that humans today were living "out of sync" with their environment, causing themselves and many other species on this planet great damage, and that humans becoming both--ecologically and socially--sustainable was the solution to this.

The difficulty of how for humans to become truly sustainable is obvious--there are far too many opinions on what would constitute a "sustainable humanity", and also on how to achieve that state.

I was thinking about the problem of humans achieving some kind of consensus on what a sustainable humanity should actually be like, because I knew that without achieving such a consensus it would be unlikely for humans to ever become truly sustainable due to the many, at times very different and even outright contrary, opinions on the matter, when one day after reading an article in a social science periodical (I cannot recall its name now) about using computer modeling to present complex social situations, I thought that, perhaps, computer modeling used to

reconcile all the various ideas about what "sustainability" for humans should mean, could be helpful. I first mentioned this, in the Fall of 1998, in a final exam for an Anthropology course--it is online at http://www.modelearth.org/Anthro415-1998-ModelEarthConcept.pdf.

The importance of sustainable solutions to our problems is obvious--any superficial "fixes" result in creating further problems, only "transparently" sustainable solutions that present situations that clearly show their ability to sustain themselves perpetually are worthy pursuing. All these "transparently" sustainable solutions could be tested whether they are really sustainable and compatible with each other in a sort of "sandbox", on a "platform", using definite, not vague, criteria that would be arrived at by using all that we know about how Earth and societal processes work--a sort of "sieve".

The "Universal Platform for Developing a Sustainable Earth Vision/Model Cooperatively" (p1) is meant to enable us to see how any idea about "sustainability"/"sustainable" would work out in the context of a sustainable world; whether on a community, regional, or at the global level.

Two things made the concept of designing the future of the Earth collectively (as presented at ModelEarth.Org) possible: Mahayana philosophy (p19) and the book *The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz. (Fritz 1984), (Please also see "Credit and Dedication" - piii)

Mahayana philosophy (p19) takes a holistic view of any system--all beings in any system (be it the whole Universe, or just a town locally) are equally important--roughly put: unless all beings are optimally happy within a system, no beings in that system can become truly happy--to present the whole of Mahayana philosophy in a single sentence. I consider Mahayana philosophy applicable to the collective situations in our world, as it becomes increasingly obvious that in any system, even a complex one (e. g. the Earth system) no parts of it are negligible; quantum theory, the science of ecology, etc., are attesting to this by their findings: all phenomena are intricately connected and influence each other in ways that we yet have to grasp, if we ever can.

The *Path of Least Resistance* (Fritz 1984) in essence says that one cannot get a desired result, unless one knows, into as small detail as possible, what that result

should be; it also says, in a nut-shell, that fighting problems without knowing how things should ideally be (in relation to those problems) will lead nowhere--one just would continue fighting "problems" forever, because there is never any shortage of problems, but rarely people know what an ideal situation that would make them happy (that they should strive for, abandoning fighting problems as their primary preoccupation) should look like.

I find the ideas contained in the book very helpful in times when I am unsure about the direction I should take--they help me to keep clear about what I want in my life.

For an individual to eventually arrive at an ideal worthy striving for is easy when compared to the difficulty of arriving at an ideal that would be acceptable to the whole of humanity. That there is a real need to arrive at ideals that would be acceptable by the whole humanity is obvious once one realizes that humanity, at any given time, always shares the same planet!, and that most of the problems we experience come from humans not having a common idea of how we all, collectively, should share the same place at the same time successfully!

The challenge is how to harmonize and unify all the various ideas that exist in this world about how this world should be ordered--ideas that often are contrary to other people's ideas, more often than not.

Donella Meadows in *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update* (Meadows 2004), pondered a similar question: ... "How do we proceed in such a way as to test our models and learn where they are right and wrong? How do we speak to each other as fellow modelers " ... (Meadows 2004); I wrote about it in an article: "Donella Meadows' "Visioning": Global Citizens Designing a Sustainable World Together." http://www.modelearth.org/donella-vision.html

Using modeling as a way of resolving differences among people would bypass the hierarchy based systems in existence now that rarely succeed in resolving of such differences successfully for long, if ever. It would not matter at the start that creating a model of an ideal situation with the participation of virtually all among whom those differences exist would have no executive powers. By having a portrayal of an ideal situation that would be acceptable (ideally) to all individuals among whom the differences exist would soon positively and profoundly affect all attempts, even those undertaken by existing official mechanisms, at resolving of those differences.

It is difficult to know what people are thinking about what kind of future they might like to have, so that we never quite know whether our ideas about what the commonly shared reality are quite "in sync" with ideas that others might have on the same subject.

Ordinarily we try to find out what others feel about important issues by the means of public discourse, but this way has its drawbacks--the meek and the disenfranchised ones are not encouraged and enabled to participate in such a discourse, and whatever reservations and objections those might have usually remain unheeded, and their discontent is carried into the future to cause problems there anew. The "silent majority/minority" that rarely takes a part in civic discourse might be enticed to participate in the modeling, because now they would have a chance to influence their own future by a process that is freely accessible by anyone, and by having the opportunity to input the modeling process everyone would also learn about all the issues pertinent to what ever aspect of creating the common ideal.

It has to be born in mind that it would never be individuals somehow competing in the model, but that it would be ideas forming the desired ideal common existence! By presenting all of these ideas in a model it would be easier to "see" what of these ideas are more realistic than others, whereas a "normal" political process is not always this transparent.

Modeling our common reality by all who are supposed to share it would reveal what all those ideas are, and how they correspond to each other.

Initially the process of such modeling might, perhaps, be considered difficult to conduct, but it is worth starting doing, because the alternative would be to continue sorting out the differences that there are among people in real life in same ways we have been using since time immemorial without much success so far, incurring real damage, more often than not.

Furthermore--I am convinced that with this kind modeling it would be possible to eventually start getting results that would be depicting more and more a sustainable ways of life, because a sustainable situation in order to be sustainable has to be transparent--it would be impossible to introduce any opacity into the model (why

bother?)--it is much easier and much more defensible to have the modeled situation as simple as possible, as transparent as possible. Imagine any social situation on Earth that would be transparent--as soon as any nonsensical element would start taking a hold it would be possible to deal with it before it would give a cause to any complications.

Designing a Lasting World Peace Together.

Over the ages most people always desired to live in a permanent state of peace; they prayed for it, imagined it, worked for it continuously since time immemorial. Lasting "Peace on Earth" is the goal of many religions and philosophies.
The reason that, so far, no lasting peace in the world materialized yet is due to our (sometimes great) differences in what we mean when we say "peace on Earth". Since we do not have a unified, common idea of the concept, "peace on Earth" can never happen. Instead we always end up fighting for *our* version of "peace", and we wonder why any lasting "Peace on Earth" never really comes about.

Knowing that every time of peace in human history ended in a war, what should "Peace on Earth" look like, so it would not result in a war again?

Unless we can answer this question, we can never achieve real "Peace on Earth".

We should learn how to imagine, in as much detail as possible, what would constitute a real "Peace on Earth", and then, since we each would have a different concept of the idea, we should learn how to reconcile all our differences in order to arrive at a *unified* idea of what "Peace on Earth" should be, because only one version of by all shared reality can manifest at a time, unless each of our versions were truly sustainable--more on this in Universal Platform for Developing Sustainable Earth Vision Cooperatively (p1).

We have to ensure that our reality is one that would be accepted by all of us who are to experience it--hence we have to first "design" our common reality to be shared by all of us in models (or using what-so-ever expedient means: "gedanken experiments", round-table discussions, etc.); we have to see that we like it, and then we set out to

materialize it coherently together, cooperating closely and enthusiastically. We have to ensure that our reality is one that would be accepted by all of us who are to experience it--hence we have to first "design" our common reality to be shared by all of us in models (or using what-so-ever expedient means: "gedanken experiments", round-table discussions, etc.); we have to see that we like it, and then we set out to materialize it coherently together, cooperating closely and enthusiastically.

Unifying and reconciling of all the different ideas that we might have about the future of the Earth in a model (or using whatever appropriate means), and then working towards this unified ideal would prevent conflicts from happening in real life, since, after all, wars happen because people go to war so that peace happens *their* way.

So that we do indeed arrive at a reality that would be preferred by all, we have to first see what it actually is that we, collectively, want! Unless we can agree on what it is that we collectively want, we would merely continue to strive for a reality that we would like to experience individually--and this would, of course, result in reconciling of our differences in real life, with all the accompanying suffering that we are familiar with: social and environmental degradation that happens only because we don't agree on what should be the best for all of us. In other words--instead of reconciling of our differences harmlessly in models (or by using any other expedient means), we let our differences to reconcile in real life causing real harm and grief.

A wish:
May all differences, all controversies, conflicts, and all complaints that there are among all of us who share this planet be resolved harmlessly in meditations, prayers, models--using what-so-ever wholesome, expedient, and appropriate means--to benefit all beings, starting with all beings that there are here and now in this world! May there be no one in this world who would not benefit optimally!

May humans become fully ecologically and socially forever transparently sustainable for their own good and for the benefit of all beings!

Meditation:
Find, or imagine that there is, a mental space in which all the ideas of what anyone might think that their future should look like would be reconciled with each other, so that conflicts in real life would be prevented from occurring.

Please dedicate your practice to the optimal benefit of all beings of all three times and ten directions of space, starting here and now on Earth.

Ecologically and Socially Sustainable Education:
Creating a Sustainable World.

Author: Mr. Jan Hearthstone

Abstract.

The purpose of ecologically and socially sustainable education is to teach the skills and to impart knowledge necessary for the establishment and perpetuation of ecologically and socially sustainable society. The first step, for the purposes of ecologically and socially sustainable education, is to determine what an "ecologically and socially sustainable society" is. This is achieved by reconciling and unifying of all individual ideas that there ever might exist of what should constitute an "ecologically and socially sustainable society" into a unified model--a model acceptable to all because it is based on all knowledge and data pertinent to the subject, and because everyone can participate in the modeling process. This unification in a model is necessary in order to avoid costly resolving ("costly" in terms of time, energy, resources, and, not infrequently, lives) of differences among those ideas in real life. This ongoing process of "reconciling and unifying of all individual ideas" into a unified model in itself would be *the*"ecologically and socially sustainable education" to the participants, because this unification process of all the diverse ideas would show what ideas would be more sustainable than others (or not), and why this should be so; in order to design a world that they would like to live in the participants would learn everything necessary for this while participating in the designing process. They would have an active interest in doing so--they would be designing a life for themselves that they would like to have.

Keywords.

"ecologically and socially sustainable education", "ecological and social sustainability", sustainable, sustainability, education, "*The Path of Least Resistance*", "Robert Fritz", "Mahayana philosophy"

Introduction.

It could be argued that for humans to live sustainably is the optimal way to exist, a way that would generate the least amount of suffering for humans and many other beings who share this world with them. The principal idea expressed in this paper--the purposeful and conscious designing of our collective sustainable future collaboratively--is based on the philosophy of Mahayana (p19) and the practical approach to creating of desired results as it is formulated in *The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz (Fritz 1984).

At present there are many people who know what they do not want in their lives, but a very few who have formed a definite image of what their ideal life should be. There are much fewer people who would like have their future to be sustainable, and there exist a myriad definitions of "sustainability", many of which are not even compatible with each other, and a lot of time resources, and energy are being wasted on trying to reconcile the differences among those definitions in real time and space. All this waste could be avoided by reconciling these differences in a model, i. e. by deciding the viability of any idea by modeling in virtuality "concrete" applications of any ideas in consideration.

Even people who do not "believe" in sustainability could use the modeling process to see how their ideas of what an ideal world should be like in a model. I contend that by using the modeling process continually, even using input of people who do not "believe" in sustainability, eventually the result would have to, inevitably, be a portrayal of a sustainable world, because no other way other than sustainable could ever be as justifiable, nor any other results could ever be as elegant and parsimonious as sustainable ones.

The modeling of the ideal, would never be in any way influenced by any ideologies, creeds, or personalities of the in-putters Only the realization that we all have to share the Earth together with as little conflict as possible would matter. Only the relevance of ideas to creating of the ideal would matter.

The modeling of an ideal future could be used even in small scale situations in conflict resolutions and also in deciding the future of smaller social units.

What is "ecologically and socially sustainable education"?

Ecologically and socially sustainable education helps to establish and maintain an ecologically and socially sustainable society. It is a part of designing of an ecologically and socially sustainable world. Participants learn what they have to learn about what "ecological and social sustainability" is, while designing their own ideal lives themselves as they go--learning what they need to learn.

What is an "ecological and social sustainability"?

There are many definitions of what constitutes "sustainability", let alone "ecological and social sustainability". Some are less abstruse than others, but there is not a single one definition of "sustainability" that would satisfy everybody.
Therefore, in order to be able to define "ecological and social sustainability", the best definition of the term would be actually showing in a model what an ideal sustainable state of any geopolitical entity ought to be by collectively inputting individual definitions into models and reconciling the differences among them by representing "concrete" portrayals of the optimal sustainable states of those entities.
(All the above is further elaborated upon bellow).

The need for a model that would show what an "ecologically and socially sustainable" world should look like.

The unification of all ideas about what our collective future should be like in a model is necessary in order to avoid costly resolving (costly in terms of time, energy, resources, and--not infrequently--lives) of differences among those ideas in real life.

It is necessary to have a good definition of "sustainable" for working purposes. Only by modeling of this definition we can get definitions of "sustainable" that actually would be "visible"--made "visible"--by "concrete" applications of "sustainable" in a model.

To reconcile all the various definitions of "ecological and social sustainability" (and to unify all ideas about what our collective future should be like generally) I propose that all of these are used to construct a model that would portray what an "ecologically and socially sustainable" (henceforth "sustainable" in this paper, for brevity sake) society, or any social entity of any size--from a local community to the whole Earth encompassing humanity. In such a model it would be possible to "see" what the each definition of "ecological and social sustainability" ("sustainability" from now on, but let

us not forget that "sustainability" should be a holistic concept, that demands all of its components to be thoroughly "sustainable" themselves) would look like when translated from the abstract to a "visible" representation of "sustainability", if in virtuality only. In this way each of the definitions' viability could be "seen" and evaluated against all other definitions and against all knowledge that is important in deciding what is "sustainable" and what is not so (e. g.--availability and distribution of resources, particular societal compositions and traits of particular societal groups, and such).

It is important to stress that this modeling should not be about "problem solving"! According to Robert Fritz in *The Path of Least Resistance* (Fritz 1984) the process of creating the results that we want to have in our lives cannot depend on "problem solving", because we never, really, run out of problems ever, and even, very unlikely, when we solve all of our problems, we still might not be even close to having what we really want to have, especially, if we don't know what that might be. The modeling has to focus on the results that we do want to have in our common reality.

The resultant emerging portrayal of an ideal state of things would not depend on the personalities of people inputting the model--only ideas would compete with each other. The process would not be hampered by the prestige, or the lack thereof, of people inputting the modeling process. Nor could anyone personally profit from taking a part in the process. The "profit" would lie in making it possible for all to design and to strive for the optimal home ever for all involved possibly obtainable with no one excluded from the process of doing so.

In essence the shaping of human society on any level, from a local community government to global concerns, driven by the desire to approach the ideal, would supersede, eventually, any form of government in existence currently, because once a justified, unified objective would be identified, the actions to achieve it would always be defensible, and because no one ever would be excluded from the political action. There is a qualitative difference between the way the society would be governed by using the modeling process and the way politics is being conducted currently. Today our future is being shaped by a very small portion of humanity, excluding a huge proportion of people who cannot influence their future significantly. Much discontent thus generated will create problems in the future, problems that will be resolved to the satisfaction of only a few again--the number of problems will be increasing till they will

be "solved", for a while, by some major societal catastrophe.

In contrast, no one ever would be excluded from modeling the ideal state of the world--all who would care to live in a better world would always be able to improve on the ideal. No one's effort in modeling of the ideal and in contributing to achieving of the ideal would be wasted--actions small and actions big will all flow coherently into the realization of the ideal--both in the model and in reality. Differences that there are among people and cause so much unhappiness in real life could be dealt with, could be resolved in the model, in most cases preemptively.

Sustainable education springs from the need of bridging the current reality with the desired state of affairs.
With a visible, collaboratively being created, and generally upon agreed model of what our ideal common reality should actually be, it would always be possible to see what the discrepancy between what is desired and what actually exists currently, in relation to the ideal, is. This discrepancy between the desired goal and what there is in reality (in respects to the desired goal) alone would be the driving force of sustainable education (I am alluding to Fritz's description in *The Path of Least Resistance*--Fritz 1984--of how "structural tension" between the desired objective and its "current reality" drives the creation of desired results).

Sustainable education would always makes sense, because at each point the whichever particular knowledge that is being acquired is clearly "seen" (by comparing the modeled desired reality with the current reality) as being necessary to know in order to achieve that which is desired.
The start of the modeling process itself would be the start of sustainable education.

Conclusion.
Most problems that humanity experiences are human made, and this fact implies a hope--it might well be within human powers to effect the healing of our world.

The "old" way of doing things will never do; obviously the "old" way got us to where we are now. We cannot look back trying to find solutions to our present problems, because any "solutions" from the past helped to get us exactly to where we are now. Any solutions based on humanity's experience from the past that have been tried have been proven ineffective, so far; ineffective in trying to deal with issues that really

matter--fulfilling basic human needs satisfactorily--QED.

We have to look, as if, into the future for solutions, more precisely--we have to design our future to our collective satisfaction, and then we can work to make this designed future our reality. It is very important to know what it actually is that we desire to have.

Alone the existence of a constantly updated, evolving model of an ideal state of the Earth would greatly improve even our current political process by "seeing" to what degree each political decision would, or would not, help to achieve the ideal state.

References.

Mahayana:
Mahayana and Ecological and Social Sustainability. (p19)

The *Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz (Fritz 1984)

teaches how to create results that one desires in one's life; it is based on the common sense observation that it is impossible for one to achieve something that one doesn't know what it actually is. In order to achieve a result, one first has to know what it is that one wants to achieve in as small a detail as possible, or, at least, to know what one wants to achieve so well that when one would encounter this goal realized, one would recognize it without a fail. This is very important in achieving sustainability--as it is today, we are professing that sustainability is what we want to achieve, with a little or no consensus among ourselves as to what this "sustainability" should actually be! It is my conviction that it will be impossible for us to ever become sustainable, unless we agree on what "sustainable"/"sustainability" is.

The process is described in the *The Path of Least Resistance* as "creating", because it concerns bringing into reality results that might not have existed ever before, bringing into being results as if out of nothing (the foregoing is loosely paraphrased from the book--*The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz--Fritz 1984).

Mahayana: Philosophy for Sustainability.

(The following reflects author's own understanding of the terms "Mahayana" and "Bodhisattva").

Mahayana is a view that acknowledges the interconnectedness of all phenomena across all time and all space; a view that posits that any- and every-one's well-being depends on the well-being of every other being's across all time and all space.

A Bodhisattva is one who strives to realize the ideal of Mahayana, and therefore regards the well-being of all other beings as important as one's own well-being.

To live ecologically and socially sustainably means to acknowledge the need of *all* beings--all beings without an exception--to live as well as possible here and now.

Thus the need for living ecologically and socially sustainably is implicit in Mahayana.

Therefore--an aspiring Bodhisattva would help all beings, starting with all beings that there are here and now (for here and now is there always), to be mentally and physically *optimally* well--with no beings favored, with no beings left behind--and therefore an aspiring Bodhisattva would promote the way of living fully ecologically and socially transparently sustainably.

To live "transparently sustainably" is necessary in order that should ever anything start becoming non-sustainable, it would be spotted and corrected soon at the start. "Transparency" in this case could be (for working purposes) defined thus: the younger a child to understand any supposedly sustainable ecologically and/or social process would be, the more a chance there is that such a process would indeed be sustainable.

IMPORTANT!: The reason that humanity has not become ecologically and socially sustainable yet, and that there still is no lasting world peace in evidence, is that we all wish, meditate and pray for different things in this regard.

What is needed is to create a unified idea of what living ecologically and socially, and what a lasting world peace should actually be like, so that we all aim for the same thing!

More on how to unify all the diverse ideas of what what ecologically and socially humanity, and what a lasting world peace should actually be like, please visit "Universal Platform for Developing Sustainable Earth Vision/Model Cooperatively" (p1), and Designing a Lasting World Peace Collectively, where I am trying to introduce a concept of designing the future of the Earth collaboratively.

MEDITATION:
Find, or imagine that there is, a space in which all the differences, controversies, conflicts, and complaints of all beings that there are here and now would be resolved, without any delay, by the power of all true Bodhisattvas ever merit by using appropriate, skillful, and expedient means, and where all the ideas of what anyone might think that their future should look like would be reconciled with the ideas of all others, so that conflicts in real life, bringing about real suffering, would be prevented from occurring.

PRAYER:
May all differences, all controversies, all conflicts, and all complaints that there are in the world among all beings be resolved harmlessly in meditations, by prayers, in models, and/or by using what-so-ever wholesome, expedient, and effective means!
May humans become ecologically and socially fully and truly transparently sustainable (and may they stay so forever!) for their own good, and for the benefit of all those beings who suffer unnecessarily only because of humans!
May we have good sustainable homes for ourselves, all our children, all our families, our friends, and our ohana!

Please dedicate your practice to the optimal benefit of all beings of all three times and ten directions of space, starting with the optimal benefit of all beings here and now on Earth.

O Bodhisattvas!

One thing in every Bodhisattva's practice in these days stands out: no matter how much we think that our practice is worth, the conditions for life in this world continue to deteriorate at ever increasing pace.

What can be going wrong? Are we not putting all our effort into our practice for the sole purpose of benefiting all beings without an exception, including, of course, all beings that there are here and now also? Why do not beings that there exist here and now benefit? Why isn't the quality of life for all beings here and now improving?
No matter what explanations there might be offered for this, none satisfies, no matter how authoritative those explanations might be. I would like to offer an explanation that, perhaps, will make sense:

The reason that things in this world are going from bad to worse generally is that Bodhisattvas, perhaps, don't have a clear idea, a clear thought in their minds of how the affairs in this world should be conducted in order to be considered the optimal conditions for existence for all beings here and now.
Or, perhaps, all Bodhisattvas in this world do have a clear ideas of what the optimal conditions for all life here and now ought to be, but not a single one of those ideas is identical to other such ideas that other Bodhisattvas might have, since there is no platform to compare our ideas that we have on the subject, and therefore we all direct our efforts towards divergent objectives.

Naturally enough--because there is no clearly defined and to everyone freely accessible idea of what this world should be like at its optimum, any betterment, any chance of conditions for all life here and now to become ideal is very small.
What needs to be done is that we all agree (by what-so-ever expedient means) on what actually the optimal conditions for all life on Earth should be. Without our harmonizing and unifying of all such ideas of what the ideal state of things in this world should be, we shall continue to see the situation in this world to deteriorate, wondering all the time how come our various practices meant to benefit all beings optimally bear no results.
!OmManiPadmeHum!

Why Prayers, Meditations, Wishes, and Any Such Don't Help to Establish a Lasting Peace in the World.

It is a safe assumption that ever since humans started experiencing the horrors of warfare, they also started to wish to live in peace that would not end with a war again.

Humans in great numbers have been wishing, praying, meditating for peace since time immemorial, but, so far, with no lasting results. Why should this be so?
The answer might be that the very reason that wars always come back is precisely because we do want to live in peace!--we don't experience a lasting peace, because our ideas of what peace should be differ from each other so greatly, that we go to war to settle our differences again and over again.

A lasting world peace is possible, of course--it is within human capabilities to effect this--but since our ideas of what such a peace should look like are so diverse, we have to learn how to resolve our differences peacefully, instead of ultimately choosing war every time we feel the desire for peace.
This is what I feel should be done:

All of us who pray, meditate, wish, and etc., for a lasting peace in the world have to get together one way or another, and come up with one unified design of a world we would like to live in. A design in which it would be possible to see how we all are to live together in one world in as small detail as possible. Differences that normally would get resolved in real life with often damaging results would be resolved harmlessly in a model during the process of hammering out of a design in which all of us would find an optimal place in.
More on how this could be done is presented at ModelEarth - www.modelearth.org

The idea on how to create a lasting Peace in the world is also presented in a different form at: Designing a Lasting Peace (p11).

Home: The Very "Leverage Point".

The most obvious place where a meaningful intervention would start a profound change for better in the whole world is the basic unit of any community--a home. It is at home where we grow up and learn the basics of living as humans; it is where we should go to get well, to rest and to recuperate; it is at home where we get ready, time after time, to interact with the world "outside". However, the "home" of today is very different from what it ideally ought to be.

A "home" today, on the whole, is an indicator of our social system's

dysfunctionality [note2]. Consider this: It is obvious to everyone that humans need to rest, to sleep, to take care of their basic needs to be able to function well within the society. To take care of all these essential needs should, of course, be done at home. Yet it is commonly accepted as a good thing when prices of homes go up and thus homes become less available. Logically, rationally this does not make any sense!

As a result of this the society, as a whole, suffers. A "home", as we know it today, is frequently a source of discomfort, anxieties, a source of existential stress, and this results in a plethora of societal ills that plague the whole society.

People who don't have a proper home are more likely to suffer from lack of rest, sleep, from financial worries (about finding a good home, about having to pay the rent, mortgages, taxes...); They, due to this stress, are more likely to engage in criminal activities, they are more likely to become physically and mentally affected, and generally the unavailability of a really good home to most members of the society creates stress that ultimately permeates all parts of the society.

The obvious solution to this conundrum would be to ensure that instead of a home to be an expensive privilege, to have a home, no matter how humble a home, should become a thing necessary for people to have in order to be able to function well in the society. In short--instead of a source of stress, a home should become a source of comfort, a place to where one goes to become well.

The most expedient way to make sure that a home becomes a secure and a sustainable foundation of the society would be to change only one thing: the right to sleep, to rest, and to be able to take a basic care of one's basic necessities would have to be introduced into the constitution as an inalienable right; No more, and no less.

To constitutionalize all the basic things that are necessary for a satisfactory quality of life as basic rights would alone ensure an organic unfolding of all necessary adjustments in the social fabric. An unfolding into a profound and lasting relief that would be felt all across the globe.

People need land to live on, to have their homes on. The surface of Earth is a

valuable and also a limited resource. A resource that is too valuable to let any irrational, fickle commercial interests to be in charge of. Land is precious, it has to be managed intelligently--all kinds of life, not only humans, need it for living; An unnecessary stress, felt by all directly and indirectly, is caused by the gross mismanagement of land that is currently in existence--a stress that we hardly can allow to exist, especially in times of ecological and social crises that we are faced with these days.

A good stress-free home (one's castle indeed!) should be the basis of any truly civilized society, regardless whether the times are good or bad. At home is where culture is being continuously re-created. If there, at home, is any lack what-so-ever, it will affect the whole of the civilization unfavorably.

Preventing a Ton of Cure: Disaster Preparedness.

Disasters, be they natural or human made, do occur--they have been occurring all throughout human history, they occur nowadays; they are nothing new to us. They do not surprise us.

Sadly though, whenever a disaster causing human and material damages happens, we act very shocked and surprised, time after time again. I say "act", because we should not, really, act surprised each time a disaster causes life loss and damage, wherever this might happen in the world, because we know of the possibility of disasters happening just about at any place on Earth, and we can envision what damages might occur at those places at such times.

Common sense dictates that it would be much wiser to prevent and to mitigate any possible effects of any disaster *before* it happens! I am sure that the state of the art of our science is such that we already are aware of the inadequacy of our disaster preparedness--why don't we use our capabilities, our knowledge to be ready (better

than we are now) in case of disasters, and more importantly--why don't we do *everything* humanly possible to prevent the terrible damages and life loss that happen every so often, *before* a disaster does happen?

All this that I write *is* very trite, but it is true--time after time again. We know that disasters do happen; we know very well what the aftermath of any potential disaster anywhere in the world could be, and yet--anytime a disaster strikes, we play the same game over and over again. We feel very sorry for the victims, we feed the huge relief industry with our money, and we are ready for the next round, without ever trying to address the problem at where it might be stemming from well enough to make a difference.

Wouldn't it be much more humane to become concerned *before* disasters happen, and feel compassion for our neighbors *before* something preventable happens and causes grief to them?

Here is what I would like to suggest:
Let us have a look all over the globe, and let us try to imagine what damages could happen should a disaster, natural or otherwise, happen there.
Let us do get prepared for any relief that might be necessary in the future for after any disaster might happen, but--let us also start suggesting what the optimal conditions at each potential disaster site would have to be to make damage and loss of life minimal, should a disaster happen there.

May all these suggestions be made "visible" in models that would be accessible to anyone on the Internet, or by using what-so-ever media available, and may all this be open to critique and input by anyone who might feel that they may have some ideas

pertinent to the subject to offer.

It would not be realistic to expect that all of these suggestions of how the ideal situations in which as little damage and life loss would happen in case of disasters would be immediately followed up upon, but, all of these suggestions would be there to be implemented when possible. The models would be there for anyone to see where to put their efforts into *before* anything bad happens, rather than be ever so concerned *after* a disaster strikes.

The news that we hear on the radio on the TV, etc., after each disaster strikes are the wrong kind of news. What the news *should* be about every day, should be about how we are preventing the *next* disaster from happening! About what the potential dangers are where, and about what should be done so that the next disaster, should it happen, would cause as little damage as possible.

Thank you sincerely - Hearthstone

Bibliography:

Fritz, Robert

1984 *The Path of Least Resistance.* Salem, MA: DMA Inc., ISBN: 0-930641-00-0.

Global Footprint Network

2009 September 25 2009 Earth Overshoot Day.

<http://www.footprintnetwork.org/images/uploads/EO_Day_Media_Backgrounder.pdf>

(accessed May 2, 2012).

Hearthstone, Jan

Donella Meadows' "Visioning":
Global Citizens Designing a Sustainable World Together.
http://www.ModelEarth.Org/donella-vision.html

Meadows, Donella H. , Jørgen Randers, and Dennis Meadows

1972 The Limits to Growth.

New York: Universe Books

Meadows, Donella H., Dennis L. Meadows, and Jørgen Randers

1992 Beyond the Limits: Confronting Global Collapse, Envisioning a Sustainable Future.

White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company

Meadows, Donella H.

1996 "Envisioning a Sustainable World." written for the Third Biennial Meeting of the International Society for Ecological Economics, October 24-28, 1994, San Jose, Costa Rica

In Getting Down to Earth, 1996 *Practical Applications of Ecological Economics*

editors Robert Costanza, Olman Segura and Juan Martinez-Alier Washington DC:

Island Press

Meadows, Donella H. "Envisioning a Sustainable World." is online:
<http://www.donellameadows.org/archives/envisioning-a-sustainable-world/>
(accessed May 25 2012)
It is a must read document; it explains best what Donella Meadows' "visioning" is.
as video
<http://vimeo.com/13213667> (accessed May 25 2012)

Meadows, Donella H., Jorgen Randers and Dennis Meadows
2004 Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update.
White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company

A synopsis of *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update.* Online at the Sustainability Institute (founded by Donella Meadows):
<http://www.sustainer.org/pubs/limitstogrowth.pdf> (accessed May 02 2012)

The *Systems Thinker*--"Moving Toward a Sustainable Future." includes chapter 8 from *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update*
<http://www.thesystemsthinker.com/V16N9.pdf> (accessed May 02 2012)

CREDIT:

The idea of designing the future of the Earth collaboratively--"ModelEarth" (a working name for the idea) --is based on Mahayana Philosophy (p19), and on the basic idea that we need to know what it is that we want to achieve well enough before we can actually start striving to achieve it. This idea is well presented in *The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz (Salem, MA, DMA, Inc., 1984, ISBN: 0-930641-00-0) whose ideas I paraphrase and quote often, not always acknowledging this in these pages.

I am grateful to Cabrillo College, and to my Alma Mater--University of Hawai'i--for giving me the education that I need for what I want to do--developing the concept of collectively designing the he future of the Earth.

DEDICATED

to the optimal physical and mental well-being of all beings anywhere and anytime. May all differences and conflicts that there are among beings in this world resolve harmlessly in meditation, with prayers, in gedanken experiments, in models, before those differences resolve in real life, not infrequently causing real harm to beings involved.

!OmManiPadmeHum!

The Necessary Qualities of Sustainable Earth Vision/Model.

A sustainable Earth vision/model has to be *universal*--it has to optimally accommodate everyone's personal vision/model of what a sustainable life on Earth should be like.

A sustainable Earth vision/model cannot be *proscriptive*; It has to be *descriptive;* it has to *show* why things in the vision/model are presented the way they are--how they organically relate to all other things in the vision/model sustainably.

By showing why the components of the vision/model are supposed to be the way they are, a sustainable Earth vision/model would *educate*.

This education would enable the participants of the vision/model creation to continually *improve* on the vision/model while actively implementing it.

Furthermore - by actively participating at realizing the vision/model people would learn--"hands on", "on the job".

This education would would become a second nature to humans; always showing why it is necessary to optimally accommodate all others within the vision/model along with one's own self.

Maintaining the vision/model to be harmonious, while continuously fine-tuning it, will become a worthy life's purpose.



Dream Flag